

Law 90-542, as amended. The Squirrel River suitability study was authorized by Public Law 96-487 (Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act).

The study conducted by the Bureau of Land Management determined that all 100 miles of the river are unsuitable for inclusion in the National WSR System. Consistent with the study, I recommend that the Congress take no action to designate the river. The withdrawal provided by section 5(a) of the WSR Act would expire within 3 years of the date of this message (unless other action is taken by the Congress). Approximately 81,501 acres of State-selected lands would be opened to mineral entry although mineral potential has been assessed as very low and there are no past or active mining claims.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 17, 2004.

### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1915

### SMART SECURITY AND CIA 9/11 REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the worst attacks on this country's soil took place on September 11, 2001, when planes hijacked by terrorists slammed into the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon. The last plane which crashed into a field in Pennsylvania was likely headed for the very building in which we are now standing, the U.S. Capitol.

Shortly after these devastating attacks, the House and Senate intelligence committees requested that the Office of the Inspector General at the Central Intelligence Agency provide a comprehensive report on the events surrounding 9/11.

In June, 2004, an 11-member team from the CIA's Office of the Inspector General completed its report after a 17-month investigation. Congress, however, still has not received this important report.

According to several intelligence officials, the CIA report is potentially damaging to the White House because it details pre-9/11 failures by members of the Bush administration. According to one official, "What all the other reports on 9/11 did not do is point the finger at individuals and give the how and what of their responsibility. This report does that."

Unfortunately, even though the CIA team finished its exhaustive report in June, it has yet to make its way to the House and Senate intelligence committees here in our Congress.

My colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the chairman and ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, wrote to the CIA in early October asking for delivery of this crucial report. They received no reply. Several sources in the intelligence community have stated that the reason for the delay has been the White House itself, which wanted the document released only after the November presidential election.

This should surprise no one.

What should surprise everyone is that the failure to deliver this report on time is unprecedented. The CIA has never failed to submit a report to Congress or delayed a report's submission for purely political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the truth behind 9/11 is too important for the Bush White House to use for partisan applications. President Bush officially opposed the creation of the independent 9/11 Commission in the first place. Only when public opinion became unwieldy did he relent and allow its creation.

Then, after the Commission was created, the President opposed providing it with enough time to complete its congressionally mandated investigative report. He relented only after public opinion weighed in against him.

President Bush initially refused to allow National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice to testify before the Commission, then relented under public pressure. Then he refused to testify before the Commission himself but relented under public pressure but only behind closed doors and with Vice President CHENEY by his side the whole time.

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way to respond to the threats America faces than by hiding behind closed doors. Instead, our government should depend on openness and transparency. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 3792, a SMART Security Platform for the 21st Century. SMART stands for sensible multi-lateral American response to terrorism. SMART Security embodies a government that is fair, open, and transparent. SMART Security treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multi-lateral partnerships, and it controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with aggressive diplomacy, strong regional security arrangements and vigorous inspection regimes.

SMART Security will defend America from future terrorist attacks by relying on the very best of America, not our nuclear capability but our capacity for multi-national leadership and our commitment to peace and freedom around the world.

If we fail to maintain the democratic principles upon which the country was founded, then we will have lost more than any terrorist could ever have taken away.

SMART Security is tough, pragmatic and safe. It depends on a government

that is open, honest and transparent, and it is the right choice to keep Americans truly secure.

### CONVENIENT RULE CHANGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today during the one minutes I got up and admonished the House Republican Conference because we heard at the time that there was a possibility that they would adopt a rule change that would overturn a previous and current GOP rule that requires House leaders to automatically relinquish their post if they are indicted on charges that could carry a sentence of 2 or more years in prison.

Now, according to Congress Daily and several other sources, in fact the Republican conference today did agree by voice vote to overturn this GOP rule, which would mean that it is no longer the case that House leaders, whether it be the Speaker, the majority leader, whatever, would automatically relinquish their post if they face such an indictment.

I said before and I will say again, now that we know the House Republican Conference has indeed adopted this rule change, that it really is inappropriate and that they should be admonished, because for many years they had touted this rule as an example of how they were always going to do the right thing and basically show that they were beyond reproach.

Now I wanted to read, if I could, some sections or quote from some sections of the Washington Post today that explain essentially why this rule change is taking place. It says, "GOP Pushes Rule Change to Protect DeLay's Post. House Republicans proposed changing their rules last night," and it in fact has changed, "to allow members indicted by State grand juries to remain in a leadership post."

"The proposed rule change, which several leaders predicted would win approval at a closed meeting today," and it did, "comes as House Republicans return to Washington feeling indebted to" majority leader DELAY for the slightly enhanced majority they won in this month's elections. DELAY led an aggressive redistricting effort in Texas last year that resulted in five Democratic House Members retiring or losing reelection.

"House Republicans adopted the indictment rule in 1993 when they were trying to end four decades of Democratic control of the House . . . They said at the time that they held themselves to higher standards than prominent Democrats."

Well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, their holding themselves to higher standards is no longer the case, because now when they see it might impact one of their leaders, they simply change the rule.

The Washington Post goes on to say in this front-page article that, "The GOP rule drew little notice until this fall, when DELAY's associates were indicted and Republican lawmakers began to worry that their majority leader might be forced to step aside."

"House Republicans recognize that DELAY fought fiercely to widen their majority, and they are eager to protect him from an Austin-based investigation they view as baseless and partisan," said one of the Republican Congressmen. He is quoted as saying, "That's why this (proposed rule change) is going to pass . . . because there is a tremendous recognition that TOM DELAY led on the issue to produce five more seats for the Republicans." After emerging from a meeting of the Republican Conference, it was assumed that in fact the rule would pass.

It did, in fact, pass. I think that it is absolutely disgraceful that it did. And I was very pleased also to see in Congress Daily today that the Democrats, who have a similar rule that requires a ranking member to step down in the event of an indictment, are now working to change the caucus rules to include a provision similar to the one that the GOP just overturned.

So what we will have now is the Republicans saying that they never wanted to do this and that if any of their leadership ever was indicted that they would certainly ask them to step down. Now that they face the possibility, they have decided to change their minds. It does not say much about ethical lapses, and it certainly, I think, will get a lot of scrutiny from the American people who will not want to see this change take place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CARING MORAL VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, Ohio Democrats took our moral values to the polls. For many of us, our faith guided us, too, and our final vote for President was far too close to declare Ohio as a State full of evangelical fundamentalists.

For many of us, moral values are guided in our religious faith. My Lu-

theran upbringing instructs me and my fellow Christians in the teachings of Jesus to read and to follow as best we can the words of the Beatitudes, to try to live our lives and practice our politics as Jesus would have wanted us to.

For others of us, those moral values take the form of a faith in our country's greatness to solve our most pressing problems of racial inequality, of inaccessible health care, of the poverty of millions of American children, and of the war in Iraq.

For 3 years I have worn a lapel pin depicting a canary in a cage. A century ago, miners took a canary into the mines to warn them of toxic gasses. Miners were forced to provide for their own protection. No mine safety laws, no trade unions able to help, no real support from their government.

A baby born in those days had a life expectancy of about 47 years. Today, because of public health initiatives, worker safety laws, Medicare, Social Security, protections for children and minorities and the disabled, as a result we live decades longer. Every bit of progress in the struggle for economic and social justice often rooted in our Judeo-Christian beliefs, every bit of progress prevailed over the opposition of society's most privileged and most powerful.

Today, those struggles continue. Our fight for seniors who are forced to choose between medicine and food in our fight against the large pharmaceutical companies' greed comes from our understanding of the holy word.

Our opposition to tax cuts for America's most privileged adults and Head Start cuts afflicting our least privileged children follow from the teachings of Christ.

Our opposition to the death penalty, keep in mind George Bush approved an execution every 2 weeks during his 6 years as governor of Texas, our opposition to the death penalty is grounded in the scriptures.

Our belief that government programs like Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, not privatized imitations of those programs, those programs should serve all Americans. Our belief that they should serve all Americans speaks a faith in the greatness of our country and its ability and willingness to lift up all of God's children.

As we have seen over the last 4 years, Republicans campaign to their religious friends on their moral values, mostly opposition to abortion and gay rights, and then govern for and with their corporate allies and contributors.

On the floor of the House of Representatives in the light of day we hear much talk from our Republican friends about moral values. But in the committee rooms and in the cloakrooms and in the back of the Chamber, choices are so often made and deals are cut that run counter to the teachings of Christ and Mohammed and the Jewish prophets and fly in the face of the values upon which our Nation was founded.

This Congress hurts families by underfunding Leave No Child Behind and college student loans, while giving tax cuts to the wealthiest among us.

This Congress hurts the elderly by defeating legislation to bring down the price of prescription drugs and then passing a Medicare bill that further enriches the drug and insurance industry.

This Congress hurts our God's earth when it caves to the energy and chemical companies.

This Congress hurts our communities when it gives tax breaks to encourage the largest corporations to outsource our jobs.

This Congress hurts our grandchildren when it loads huge burdens of debt on future generations.

Those are not the right moral values.

Tens of thousands of Ohioans worked feverishly for months to help change our Nation's course because of our moral values, because of our faith in God and because of our belief in the Nation's history of taking care of the least among us.

In no way do I question the faith of my political opponents, but I am weary of the far right's claim that they are the only ones guided by the hand of God.

My understanding of the teaching of Christ, my religious upbringing calls me to walk a different path and to express and act upon my faith in the cause of social and economic justice.

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PEARCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN DENISE MAJETTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE) is a lifelong public servant who has spent her career fighting for our families and our children.

DENISE MAJETTE was born into a working-class family, her mother, a teacher, and her father, a civil servant, who instilled in her the values of hard work, dedication to public service and strong religious beliefs. It is these childhood lessons that guided her life and her rise from these roots against tremendous odds to become one of the first African American women to attend Yale University and Duke University School of Law.

Upon graduation, DENISE MAJETTE answered the call of public service, joining the Legal Aid in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, as a staff attorney. At Legal Aid, DENISE MAJETTE helped hardworking families who were struggling to make ends meet.